

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated June 6, 2007. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections and rejections set forth in the Office Action are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3, 5 and 7 are pending. Claims 2, 4, 6 and 8 have been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Claims 1 and 3 have been amended. Support for the claim changes can be found in the original disclosure, and therefore no new matter has been added. Claims 1 and 3 are in independent form.

The Examiner objected to the abstract on formal grounds, and required a more descriptive title. The abstract and title have been amended accordingly. Withdrawal of these objections is respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 4, 6 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,363,342 (*Shaw et al.*).

Claims 1, 3, 5 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Shaw et al.* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,896,321 (*Miller et al.*).

Without conceding the propriety of the rejections over the prior art, the independent claims have been amended. Applicant submits that the amended independent claims are allowable over the cited art, for at least the reasons set forth below.

According to Applicant's claimed invention, there are provided two input modes for inputting pronunciation symbols, and an input mode change means for changing between these two modes. One mode may be a direct input mode (first input mode), in

which a user inputs a pronunciation symbol directly. The other input mode may be an associative input mode (second input mode), in which the user inputs an English notation.

Further, according to Applicant's claimed invention, there is provided display means for extracting pronunciation symbols corresponding to an alphabet inputted by a user from pronunciation symbol information (indicating a relationship between a predetermined alphabet and a pronunciation symbol that starts from the predetermined alphabet) if the input mode is the first input mode and from associative pronunciation symbol information (indicating a relationship between a predetermined alphabet and a pronunciation symbol when the predetermined alphabet forms a part of an arbitrary English notation) if the input mode is the second input mode.

Shaw et al. relates to a system for developing word-pronunciation pairs, including a transcription generator that receives spelled word input from a user and generates a list of suggested phonetic transcriptions. Even if, for the sake of argument, *Shaw et al.* be deemed to teach a single input mode, nothing in *Shaw et al.* is understood to teach or suggest at least a first input mode and a second input mode, input change means for changing the input mode between the first and second input modes, or display means for extracting pronunciation symbols corresponding to an alphabet inputted by a user from pronunciation symbol information (indicating a relationship between a predetermined alphabet and a pronunciation symbol that starts from the predetermined alphabet) if the input mode is first input mode and from the associative pronunciation symbol information (indicating a relationship between a predetermined alphabet and a pronunciation symbol when the predetermined alphabet forms a part of an arbitrary English notation) if the input mode is second input mode, and for displaying the extracted pronunciation symbols with

corresponding image symbols while sorting the extracted pronunciation symbols on the basis of statistical information (associated with a probability of occurrence of each pronunciation symbol immediately after a predetermined pronunciation symbol), as claimed in Claim 1.

Miller et al. relates to a text completion system for a miniature computer, which automatically displays a prioritized list of completion suggestions for a partial data entry in response to a pause in the entry, based on search criteria and display criteria. Nothing in *Miller et al.* is understood to teach or suggest at least a first input mode and a second input mode, input change means for changing the input mode between the first and second input modes, or display means for extracting pronunciation symbols corresponding to an alphabet inputted by a user from pronunciation symbol information (indicating a relationship between a predetermined alphabet and a pronunciation symbol that starts from the predetermined alphabet) if the input mode is first input mode and from the associative pronunciation symbol information (indicating a relationship between a predetermined alphabet and a pronunciation symbol when the predetermined alphabet forms a part of an arbitrary English notation) if the input mode is second input mode, and for displaying the extracted pronunciation symbols with corresponding image symbols while sorting the extracted pronunciation symbols on the basis of statistical information (associated with a probability of occurrence of each pronunciation symbol immediately after a predetermined pronunciation symbol), as claimed in Claim 1.

Since neither *Shaw et al.* nor *Miller et al.*, whether taken singly or in combination (even assuming, for the sake of argument, that such combination were permissible), teaches or suggests all of the elements of independent Claim 1, that claim is

believed allowable over those documents. Since independent Claim 3 includes subject matter similar to that of Claim 1, Claim 3 is believed allowable for at least the same reasons.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as references against the independent claims herein. These claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103, favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Douglas W. Pinsky
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 46,994

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
DWP/klm

FCHS_WS 1554498v1